

**Gallatin County Planning Board  
Infrastructure Committee  
Water and Wastewater Subcommittee  
Record of Meeting: August 25, 2008**

**Members present:** C.B. Dormire (Subcommittee Chair); Gail Richardson, Don Seifert, Kerry White; Sean O’Callaghan, County Planning Department.

- 1. Call to Order:** 4:00 p.m.
- 2. Discussion of Consulting Engineering Study:**

C.B. provided a handout titled *Tentative discussion draft summary memorandum of CBD’s understanding of Wastewater and Water Subcommittee discussions to date concerning the scope and substance of a further Engineering Study.*

Gail questioned from a procedural standpoint when the Committee should run this proposal by the Commission.

C.B. agreed that doing so was important, and said that he tried to express that point in the last paragraph of his memo.

Don questioned how formal the scope of work needs to be before it was presented to the Commission.

C.B. acknowledged the difference between a draft scope of work and a formal Request for Proposals

Sean said that he thought the Commission would be more concerned about the content of a draft scope of work, rather than the form that it was presented to them; however, if the Commission decides to engage additional input from outside parties, it would benefit the Committee to have the scope tightened down fairly well.

Kerry asked if we ever got the information we were promised from Robert Seamons (Stahly Engineering). CB said that we had not, but he would follow up on it.

The group discussed the details of item #1 in C.B.’s document. The group questioned the role of economics in this study. C.B. clarified that he wanted to know how much it was going to cost a developer to build the system. Kerry stated his preference that the scope of work include a component where the consultant would compare and contrast the amount of land that the various treatment options would require.

The group discussed the details of item #2 in C.B.’s document. The group questioned whether “size” was in reference to the amount of land required for a treatment area or in reference to amount of land area that could be developed that would require wastewater

treatment. C.B. clarified that his intent was to locate sites within the study area where wastewater treatment plants could be placed to serve development efficiently and economically. Kerry expressed a concern about identifying a hypothetical location of a wastewater treatment plant on a piece of property without discussing the issue with the landowner first. The group agreed that 2(a) was redundant with 2(b) and that 2(a) should be removed. Kerry expressed a concern about maximum buildout potential being assumed based on the proposed Growth Policy Implementation Program (2.b). The group discussed this concern at length and decided the emphasis was on the consultant needing to assume maximum buildout for various reasons. The group agreed the assumption for 2(d) should be based on a reasonable amount of new commercial and industrial load volumes with appropriate pretreatment precautions incorporated.

3. **Member Reports:** Gail reported that she heard from Stephanie Nelson and that the Board of Health Committee is currently collecting information on the permitting issue.
4. **Next meeting Date and Agenda:** September 8<sup>th</sup>, continuation of discussion on scope of work.
5. **Other Business:** none discussed
6. **Adjourn:** 6:00 p.m.